

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application. Claims 1-12 and 14-18 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 19-24 have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicant elects to pursue claims 1-12 and 14-18 (Group I).

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,003,069 to Barry Richard Cavill (hereinafter "Cavill") in view of Applicant's admitted Prior Art. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 and 14-18 are patentable over Cavill in view of Applicant's admitted Prior Art.

Cavill discloses:

... a new printer driver system which is surprisingly effective for use with NCs. In its simplest terms, the present invention divides the print task up into portions that can be processed locally and portions that can be processed by a server. Typically, the server will be more capable of processing data than the NC and will have a greater amount of storage space. The benefits of the invention are that the server is used for temporary storage and processing, thereby alleviating the burden on the NC. Printing of more complex, high quality information is more feasible than using the traditional driver inside the NC. Col. 2, lines 37-47.

In discussing the printer driver system, the Cavill reference further states, "In essence, the driver is split between the NC and the server, with each part performing the tasks that are best suited for the systems on which they reside."

Col. 2, lines 56-59. The printer driver system disclosed in Cavill includes a client-side driver subsystem and a server-side driver subsystem. These two subsystems share print tasks. See col. 3, line 58 – col. 4, line 10. The client-side driver subsystem is associated with the NC (network computer) and the server-side driver subsystem is associated with the server. After the two subsystems have processed a print job, the print data is sent to a printer device. See col. 6, lines 24-28.

Claim 1 of the present application recites:

A method of handling a print job, the method comprising:
determining whether the entire print job can be processed by a printer;
processing the print job, by the printer, if the entire print job can be processed by the printer;
if the entire print job cannot be processed by the printer:
 sending, by the printer, the print job to an external rendering device;
 receiving, by the printer, a rendered print job from the external rendering device; and
 the printer printing the rendered print job received from the external rendering device.

Thus, claim 1 includes “if the entire print job cannot be processed by the printer: sending, by the printer, the print job to an external rendering device....” This feature is not disclosed or suggested by Cavill. As discussed above, Cavill discloses a printer driver having a server-side subsystem and a client-side subsystem. These subsystems are not part of the printer device. In the disclosure of Cavill, the printer device is not involved in the separation of print tasks into multiple portions. Instead, the NC and the server handle one or more portions of a print task. After the NC and the server have handled their

portions of the print task, the resulting print data is sent to a printer device. Therefore, Cavill does not disclose or suggest the printer sending the print job to an external rendering device.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action also cites page 1, line 23 – page 2, line 6 of the present application (Applicant's admitted Prior Art). The cited language states:

Other printers may be capable of processing print jobs in multiple languages. These printers are typically more complicated because they are required to identify, interpret and process print commands in several different languages. Although these printers are more complicated, they typically require an attached processing device to provide the print job and other printer control information to the printer. Another type of printer contains its own print rendering engine that is capable of generating a printed output document from raw print job data. Although this type of printer contains its own print rendering engine, it is typically coupled to a processing device, such as a computer, to receive the raw print job data generated, for example, by an application running on the computer.

The above discussion mentions that a printer may contain its own print rendering engine to process certain types of data. However, this discussion does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. For example, the above discussion does not disclose or suggest “determining whether the entire print job can be processed by a printer” as recited in claim 1. Further, the above discussion does not disclose or suggest “if the entire print job cannot be processed by the printer: sending, by the printer, the print job to an external rendering device....” as recited in claim 1.

Further, the combination of Cavill and Applicant's admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest a printer that sends a print job to an external rendering device if the entire print job cannot be processed by the printer, as

recited in claim 1. Neither Cavill nor Applicant's admitted Prior Art discuss that a printer may determine whether an entire print job can be processed. Since neither reference individually discloses or suggests such a feature, the combination of Cavill and Applicant's admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Cavill in view of Applicant's admitted Prior Art. Given that claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Cavill and Applicant's admitted Prior Art for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 8 of the present application recites:

A method comprising:
receiving, by a printer, a print job;
the printer identifying portions of the print job that can be processed by the printer;
the printer processing the identified portions of the print job;
the printer sending the portions of the print job that cannot be processed by the printer to an external rendering device; and
the printer receiving rendered portions of the print job from the external rendering device.

As discussed above, the Cavill reference discloses a printer device that is not involved in the separation of print tasks into multiple portions. Instead, the separation of print tasks into multiple portions is performed by a printer driver having a server-side subsystem and a client-side subsystem. Thus, Cavill does not disclose or suggest "the printer identifying portions of the print job that can be processed by the printer" as recited in claim 8. Further, Cavill fails to disclose or suggest "the printer sending the portions of the print job that cannot

be processed by the printer to an external rendering device” as recited in claim 8.

Additionally, Applicant’s admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest “the printer identifying portions of the print job that can be processed by the printer” as recited in claim 8. Applicant’s admitted Prior Art also fails to disclose or suggest “the printer sending the portions of the print job that cannot be processed by the printer to an external rendering device” as recited in claim 8.

Further, the combination of Cavill and Applicant’s admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest a printer that identifies portions of the print job that can be processed by the printer, as recited in claim 8. Additionally, the combination of Cavill and Applicant’s admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest a printer that sends the portions of the print job that cannot be processed by the printer to an external rendering device, as recited in claim 8. Since neither reference individually discloses or suggests these features, the combination of Cavill and Applicant’s admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest these features.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is allowable over Cavill in view of Applicant’s admitted Prior Art. Given that claims 9-12 and 14 depend from claim 8, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Cavill and Applicant’s admitted Prior Art for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claim 15 of the present application recites:

A printer comprising:
a communication interface; and
a processor coupled to the communication interface, wherein the processor determines whether an entire print job can be processed by the printer, if the entire print job cannot be processed by the printer, then the printer sends the portions of the print job that cannot be processed by the printer to an external rendering device, and the printer receives rendered portions of the print job from the external rendering device.

As discussed above, the Cavill reference discloses a printer device that is not involved in the separation of print tasks into multiple portions. Instead, Cavill discloses that the separation of print tasks into multiple portions is performed by a printer driver having a server-side subsystem and a client-side subsystem. Thus, Cavill does not disclose or suggest a printer having a processor that “determines whether an entire print job can be processed by the printer” as recited in claim 15.

As discussed above, Applicant’s admitted Prior Art mentions that a printer may contain its own print rendering engine to process certain types of data. However, Applicant’s admitted Prior Art does not disclose or suggest a printer having a processor that “determines whether an entire print job can be processed by the printer” as recited in claim 15.

Further, the combination of Cavill and Applicant’s admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest a printer that determines whether an entire print job can be processed by the printer, as recited in claim 15. Neither Cavill nor Applicant’s admitted Prior Art discuss that a printer may determine whether an entire print job can be processed by the printer. Since neither reference

individually discloses or suggests such a feature, the combination of Cavill and Applicant's admitted Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over Cavill in view of Applicant's admitted Prior Art. Given that claims 16-18 depend from claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Cavill and Applicant's admitted Prior Art for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-12 and 14-18 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8-03-04

By: 

Steven R. Sponseller
Reg. No. 39,384
(509) 324-9256